

Message

---

**From:** Bacalan, Vince [Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 4/5/2019 8:26:37 PM  
**To:** Jennifer Hecker [JHecker@chnep.org]  
**CC:** Yelensky, Erica [Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

Hi Jennifer (and Erica),

Quick updates. Since sending the email below, I've chatted with Tom last Thursday about the best way to address my comments without changing too much of their existing content. I sent a note to them today since I haven't heard back from them on this.

I will also follow-up with a calendar invite (I'm leaning toward Monday, April 15 now instead of the 12).

I also want to thank you for the quick delivery of your initial comments. Without these, I would not have looked at their PE submission more closely until much later. What you've submitted so far are on the mark as they relate to their performance measures responses (I've come to similar conclusions as you during my initial review so far).

My only ask is to wait for their revised narrative to re-review their details in the context of the six workplan elements (water quality, habitat, living resources, healthy communities, direct assistance, training). It occurred to me that there are also six **performance measures metrics** along with the **workplan elements** (when I saw the structure of your narrative summary comments). I sensed that this may have contributed to the confusion.

In preparing for your own PE next year, it might help you to make the distinction that the overall programmatic/operations side of your NEP are covered under the performance measures. Your actual 'body of work' per se that's contained in those workplans are used to 'tell the story' about how your NEP is addressing a variety of issues in your study area, regardless of how your CCMP is structured.

Not everyone is a fan of the logic model (page 12 of the PE Guidance) but at least there it clearly shows the distinction of programmatic versus work plan elements that ultimately both link back to your CCMP. It's taken me a few PEs to recognize and understand this concept. Hopefully it'll be smooth sailing for us from here on.

Thanks again for your contribution,  
Vince

---

**From:** Tom Ford <tford@santamonicabay.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 26, 2019 8:32 PM  
**To:** Bacalan, Vince <Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov>; Yelensky, Erica <Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov>; Karina Johnston <kjohnston@santamonicabay.org>; Jennifer Hecker <JHecker@chnep.org>  
**Cc:** Heather Burdick <hburdick@santamonicabay.org>; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards <Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

Vince,

Arguably we'll be better able to inform that than you. Let us see how we can best pull that together and quickly!

Regards,

Tom

---

**From:** Bacalan, Vince <Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 26, 2019 3:06 PM

**To:** Yelensky, Erica <Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov>; Karina Johnston <kjohnston@santamonicabay.org>; Jennifer Hecker <JHecker@chnep.org>

**Cc:** Tom Ford <tford@santamonicabay.org>; Heather Burdick <hburdick@santamonicabay.org>; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards <guangyu.wang@waterboards.ca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

Hi SMBNEP staff,

In my quick glance of your PE package, I want to follow-up on something before we get too far into the review process.

Per page 6 of the Funding Guidance, you superimposed the six workplan elements (Habitat, Water Quality, Living Resources, Healthy Communities, Trainings, Direct Assistance) with your CCMP goals. While your discussion of your 5-year accomplishments on the 14 goals of your CCMP is quite exhaustive, the PE narrative should specifically highlight where the NEP currently is in terms of those six workplan elements (e.g., what's the state of water quality, habitat, trainings, etc. in SMBNEP during this PE period?). Where the logic model fits in here is to gauge your level of progress in addressing these elements in addition to including select examples from your work plans to base your 5-year story on.

Do you guys have something like this in your earlier drafts? I'm afraid that it might be difficult for us to extract these details easily to gain a better understanding of where you are. I also have not read it entirely to see if we can correlate your CCMP goals to specific work plan elements (as referenced in Table 3 on page 10 of your narrative section). How do we distinguish your CCMP goals from specific work plan elements when they overlap across multiple disciplines? I think this is where it might get confusing for us to properly evaluate you on. It's certainly not for lack of examples.

I'd like to get your reaction based on this. Apologies for bringing this up now but I also want to give you the opportunity to respond while we still have time.

Thanks,  
Vince

---

**From:** Bacalan, Vince

**Sent:** Friday, March 22, 2019 12:44 PM

**To:** Yelensky, Erica <Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov>; Karina Johnston <kjohnston@santamonicabay.org>; Jennifer Hecker <JHecker@chnep.org>

**Cc:** Tom Ford <tford@santamonicabay.org>; Heather Burdick <hburdick@santamonicabay.org>; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards <Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov>

**Subject:** RE: SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

Please accept my delayed acknowledgement but many thanks to Tom and SMBNEP staff for the effort in developing this PE package. I look forward to reading and learning more about Santa Monica Bay NEP.

As Erica correctly pointed out, the PE Review Team (myself, Erica, Jennifer) will review, discuss, and deliberate over the next few weeks. I will get back in touch with you to schedule a call and offer our preliminary findings and assessments. I know Jennifer has a hectic May schedule so we're aiming to check off the milestones by then and begin planning for the site visit.

Thanks again and we will get back to you with any additional requests, if any.

Vince

---

**From:** Yelensky, Erica

**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2019 7:53 PM

**To:** Karina Johnston <[kjohnston@santamonicabay.org](mailto:kjohnston@santamonicabay.org)>; Bacalan, Vince <[Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov](mailto:Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov)>; Jennifer Hecker <[JHecker@chnep.org](mailto:JHecker@chnep.org)>

**Cc:** Tom Ford <[tford@santamonicabay.org](mailto:tford@santamonicabay.org)>; Heather Burdick <[hburdick@santamonicabay.org](mailto:hburdick@santamonicabay.org)>; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards <[Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

Hi Karina and Tom,

Thank you for sending your program evaluation package. This is an amazing amount of information and a testament all day work you have done over the past five years.

I was able to download a zip file with most or all of the documents from the dropbox link. I got an error message for a few of the files, but I may be able to extract them individually from dropbox.

Below are the next steps per the PE guidance. It looks like Vince will schedule a follow-up conference for mid to late April.

Enjoy the beautiful weather this weekend.

Best,

Erica

1) The PE team members should review the PE package and submit written electronic comments to the PE team leader within three weeks after receiving the PE package.

2) The PE team leader should hold a conference call with the PE team members one week after receiving comments from the PE team. The purpose of this conference call is to:

- discuss the PE findings; and
- identify follow-up questions or information gaps requiring the NEP to submit additional documentation.

3) The PE team leader should schedule a conference call between the NEP Director and the PE team within two weeks after conducting the PE team conference call. The purpose of this conference call is to:

- discuss strengths and challenges of the NEP;
- discuss additional documentation needed to address any information gaps identified by the PE team. Such documentation should be provided for EPA review prior to the on-site visit or demonstrated during the on-site visit; and
- schedule and discuss the agenda for the on-site visit

---

**From:** Karina Johnston <[kjohnston@santamonicabay.org](mailto:kjohnston@santamonicabay.org)>

**Sent:** Friday, March 15, 2019 4:14 PM

**To:** Yelensky, Erica <[Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov](mailto:Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov)>; Bacalan, Vince <[Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov](mailto:Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov)>; Jennifer Hecker <[JHecker@chnep.org](mailto:JHecker@chnep.org)>

**Cc:** Tom Ford <[tford@santamonicabay.org](mailto:tford@santamonicabay.org)>; Heather Burdick <[hburdick@santamonicabay.org](mailto:hburdick@santamonicabay.org)>; Wang, Guangyu@Waterboards <[Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Guangyu.Wang@waterboards.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** SMBNEP 2019 Program Evaluation Package

**Importance:** High

Hello PE Review Team –

Attached, please find SMBNEP's 2019 Program Evaluation package, including the following reporting documentation:

- 1) Standardized Performance Measure Worksheets
- 2) SMBNEP Work Plan Narrative Report

### 3) List of Attachments (Deliverables)

In addition to the attached files, there are approximately 1,500 supporting documents (itemized in the list of attachments database). These supporting materials are uploaded onto dropbox, but we can also send via another electronic method, if preferred. We can also mail a flash drive to each of you on Monday, if you would prefer. The attached documents contain clickable cross-referenced hyperlinks to key Attachments, which open in the online dropbox folder and require internet access to display correctly. They are also available for download through this direct link:

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ounfum78mxbcl5s/AAArsYSn3n4RE1J3Pk\\_sB4jka?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ounfum78mxbcl5s/AAArsYSn3n4RE1J3Pk_sB4jka?dl=0)

Thank you, and we look forward to feedback!

**Karina Johnston**

*Science Director*

—

**The Bay Foundation**

Office: (310) 216-9824

[kjohnston@santamonicabay.org](mailto:kjohnston@santamonicabay.org)

[www.santamonicabay.org](http://www.santamonicabay.org)

